

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the film is a monolayer film. Support is found in the original application, in particular in the Examples and Fig. 1. Further, new claims 15-17 have been added. Support for claims 15-17 is found in the original application, in particular on page 53, lines 1-21 and on page 67, lines 1-12.

It is submitted that the amendment does not raise any new issues. Accordingly, entry and consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Independent claim 1, and claims 2-10 and 15-17 dependent thereon, are directed to a polarizer. Claims 11-14 are directed to a polarizing plate, an optical film, and an image display, respectively, and are dependent on claim 1, claims 1 or 11, claims 1 or 11, and claim 12, respectively.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by WO 01/55753A ("Ito"), and claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ito.

As indicated in the response filed on October 24, 2005, the rejections are respectfully traversed. The polarizer of the present claims comprises a monolayer film which has a minute domain dispersed in a matrix formed of a translucent water-soluble resin including an iodine light absorbing material, as recited in present claim 1. Such film is completely different from the multilayer lamination including (i) a continuous phase/discontinuous phase layer 12, which does not contain iodine, and (ii) a light scattering layer 24, as in Ito. As a result,

Amendment  
Serial No. 10/681,384  
Attorney Docket No. 032009

Ito fails to teach or suggest the presently claimed invention. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over Ito.

Also, with respect to the dependent claims, Ito also is completely silent as to the combinations of features recited in these respective claims, as discussed in details in the previous response.

In particular, with respect to claims 15-17, it is submitted that, even if, *arguendo*, the Examiner's interpretation of Ito were accepted, the minute domains of Ito are dispersed in the matrix only in layer 12, while the iodine is dispersed in the matrix only in layer 14, so that they are not dispersed "throughout" the matrix of Ito, and in particular, they are not dispersed in the same portion of the laminate "film" of Ito. As a result, for these respective reasons alone, each of claims 15-17 is not obvious over Ito.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment  
Serial No. 10/681,384  
Attorney Docket No. 032009

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,373

**Atty. Docket No. 032009**  
**Customer No.: 38834**  
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 822-1100  
Fax: (202) 822-1111  
NES:rep